APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/518,772	08/01/2005	Christopher Rodd Speirs	CH02 0021 US	4888

65913   7590   12/29/2008
NXP, B.V.
NXP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
M/S41-SJ
1109 MCKAY DRIVE
SAN JOSE, CA 95131

EXAMINER
ABDIN, SHAHEDA A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2629	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/29/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ip.department.us@nxp.com

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14 have been considered but are not persuasive.

As to claims 1:

Applicant argues that (1) " the modification of the He reference proposed by the Examiner would render He unsatisfactory for its intended purpose", (2) The Examiner's proposed modification would result in the reset line 113 no longer being used to reset the shift registers of the row driver 140, thereby changing the principle of operation of the he reference", (3) " there is no motivation to modify the He reference in the proposed by the examiner, therefore, the rejection of claims 1-14 are improper".

In response (1)-(3), Examiner disagree applicant's point of view. Note that logic is a required element in order to provide signal to the scanning lines in the display devices. However, He's reference teaches a logic function (i.e. 110 having logic zero), wherein the logic function deactivates/activates the row outputs in dependence on the partial mode responsive to a first control signal. Also note that the reset line (i.e.113) resetting the data of shift register to control the partial mode. Examiner introduced Duwaer's reference only to teach the logic function (I.e. 61-63 having h logic) is connected in the row drive circuit (row scanner) in front of each of row outputs (i.e. g -g) (see Fig. 2, Fig. 9,column 4, lines 43-44, and column 8, lines 41-55). On the otherhand, in Duwaer's reference, the shift register 54 is reset by control line Vblank use for providing reset of activation/ deactivation to the shift register which is connected to the logic function (61-63 having h logic). Consequently the system of He does not render Duwaer inoperable and thus, He does not teach away from the teachings of Duwaer . Thus, the Examiner's rationale for combination of He and Duwaer is proper because this combination provides improvement over the He and Duwaer and proper motivation that renders an obvious combination. The Obviousness teaching is that Duwaer's logic function could be placed in front of at least one row output of the display system of He so that the logic function could be included in the row drive circuit in front of at least one row output, which logic function a first control signal being supplied the first control signal achieving a deactivation/activation of the at least one row output in dependence on the partial mode. In this configuration the system would have an improved driving circuitry for accurate data transmission in the display device (Duwaer, column 3, lines 67-68, column 4, lines 1-10). The test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary

reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

As to claim 6:

Applicant argues that "rejection of claim 6 is improper, because He's reference does not teach the limitations as recited in the claim".

In response, Examiner disagree Applicant's point of view. Note that he's reference teaches the limitations in such that a control logic (i.e. control logic, associated with 113, see Fig. 2, in the reference of He) in the column drive circuit (130, see Fig. 1) generates the first control signal (i.e. signal 113 towards column driver 130) in dependence on the partial mode and supplies the first control signal to the row driver circuit (140, Fig. 1) (i.e. signal 113, towards the row driver 140) (column 2, lines 41-46, column 3, lines 1-30, fig. 1) . Thus, the reference of He teaches the claim limitations as recited in claim 6.